

**REMARKS**

Claim 1, for example, calls for performing an automated rating algorithm to rate content based on said descriptions. The descriptions that are referred to are content descriptions of available broadcast content. Thus, the content descriptions do not include the actual broadcast content itself, but, rather, a description of that content. It is suggested that such an automated rating system is taught in the cited reference to Dudkiewicz.

Claim 22 calls for generating a display on the display device that provides a user interface that enables the user to rate content pieces so as to indicate a level of desirability for those pieces "if they are broadcast by the broadcast system." Thus, claim 22, dependent on claim 1, adds the notion of not only providing automated ratings, but also including user ratings. Those user ratings must not be based on the actual content broadcast, but, instead, must be based on the content descriptors because claim 22 calls for indicating a level of desirability for those content pieces "if they are broadcast by the broadcast system."


Thus, dependent claim 22 implicates a system in which the client does automated ratings based on content descriptors and the user does non-automated ratings based on those content descriptors in order to determine the desirability of the content pieces if they are broadcast by the broadcast system. Thus, the user's analysis must be based not on the content, because then the content would already have been broadcast. It must necessarily be based on the content descriptors.

Claim 22 was rejected based on the combination of Dudkiewicz and Hackson, with the indication that Hackson teaches the user rating system at pages 3-4. But a review of pages 3-4 of Hackson clearly shows that Hackson is talking about "viewer" feedback. Viewer feedback must be feedback from those who have already viewed the content. Thus, Hackson teaches away from the concept of automatic and non-automatic rating of content based on content descriptors, rather than on broadcast of the content itself.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 22 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 24, 2008



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation